

REMARKS

In the Official Action of July 10, 2009, restriction was required under 35 U.S.C. §121 and §372 among the following seven (7) alleged inventions or groups of claims:

- I. Claims 1-11, drawn to a protein comprising HC and LC that binds to an activated conformation of LFA-1;
- II. Claims 12-17, drawn to a method of treating or preventing inflammation or an inflammatory disorder comprising administering a protein comprising HC and LC that binds to an activated conformation of LFA-1;
- III. Claims 18-21, drawn to a method of suppressing an immune response comprising administering a protein comprising HC and LC that binds to an activated conformation of LFA-1;
- IV. Claim 22, drawn to a method of treating or preventing a disorder in a subject comprising identifying a subject in need of an anti-LFA-1 antibody that preferentially binds to the activated form of LFA-1, but which subject does not respond to or tolerate an anti-LFA-1 antibody that binds to activated and non-activated LFA-1 protein, and administering the anti-LFA-1 antibody that preferentially binds to the activated form of LFA-1;
- V. Claims 23-27, drawn to a method of modulating LFA-1 activity, the method comprising providing an LFA-1 binding protein of HC and LC that binds to an activated conformation of LFA-1;
- VI. Claims 28-29, drawn to a method for detecting the presence of an LFA-1 protein, in a sample, *in vitro* comprising contacting the sample with an LFA-1 binding protein comprising HC and LC that binds to an activated conformation of LFA-1;
- VII. Claims 30-33, drawn to a method for detecting the presence of activated LFA-1 *in vivo*, the method comprising administering to a subject an LFA-1 binding protein comprising HC and LC that binds to an activated conformation of LFA-1;

In response to the restriction requirement, applicant hereby elects the invention of the Group I claims, i.e. claims 1-11, drawn to a protein comprising HC and LC that binds to an activated conformation of LFA-1, for further prosecution on the merits, this election being made with traverse. This traversal is made on the basis that the groups of claims are interrelated and can be conveniently searched in one location. In this regard, it is noted that the search class and subclass for each group has not been specifically identified in the restriction requirement.

The Office Action states that only Groups II and V require an election of species. Accordingly, since Group I has been elected, no election of species is required.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration of the restriction requirement, and prompt action on the merits of the claims, is respectfully solicited.

/William G. Gosz/

Date:2009-08-06

William G. Gosz, Reg. No. 27,787
Rissman Hendricks & Oliverio, LLP
Customer Number 21127
Tel: (617) 367-4600 Fax: (617) 367-4656